DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 355 EA 023 942

AUTHOR Hallinger, Philip; And Others
TITLE Conceptualizing School Restructuring: Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; Participative Decision Making; *Principals; School Based Management; *School Restructuring; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Findings from a study that explored teachers' and principals' views on restructuring are presented in this paper. Methodology involved interviews conducted with 14 elementary, middle, and high school teachers and with 15 public school principals in New York, Illinois, and Tennessee. Three issues that will affect the future directions of restructuring were identified: (1) a lack of connection between changes in school governance structures and changes in teaching and learning; (2) differences between teachers and principals about the nature of teacher participation in school decision making; and (3) the lack of a link between decision making and accountability. A conclusion is that the success of formalized procedures for sharing authority is unlikely without trust. Although differences existed between teachers' and principals' views about restructuring, a more fundamental discrepancy existed between the perspectives of practitioners and policymakers. (29 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345355

Conceptualizing School Restructuring:

Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions

by

Philip Hallinger

Joseph Murphy

Charles Hausman1

Vanderbilt University

and

The National Center for Educational Leadership2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Hausman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, 1992.

EA 023 942

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In schools throughout the world, initiatives to restructure education are taking root. They have gained momentum from widespread dissatisfaction with the outcomes of schooling and the educational conditions believed to be responsible for these outcomes. Consequently, efforts are underway in Australia, New Zealand, the United States, Canada, and Great Britain to fundamentally transform the basic components of educational systems (Elmore, 1990a; Murphy, 1990).

This process of reinventing public schooling is occurring simultaneously on three fronts. Measures are being formulated and strategies are being implemented to:

(1) decentralize the organizational structure of schools (e.g., school-based management);

(2) empower teachers, parents, and students to reshape and direct the education system (e.g., the ascendancy of school choice plans, an enhanced voice for teachers and parents in site level decision-making, new roles and responsibilities for teachers); and

(3) transform the teaching-learning process that unfolds in classrooms (e.g., the replacement of the entrenched psychological model of teaching with a sociologically oriented perspective of instruction, the acknowledgment of the importance of professional craft knowledge) (Elmore, 1990b; Murphy, 1991; Rowan, 1990; Smith & O'Day, 1990).

To date, the bulk of attention in the restructuring movement has been devoted to organizational and governance issues. Considerably less attention has been invested in conceptualizing how the core technology of curriculum and instruction should be revised in conjunction with restructuring efforts. The deficiency is twofold. Few researchers are attempting to develop links from proposed structural and political alternatives to

classroom processes. Even fewer investigators are undertaking to develop new views of organization and governance based on the most appropriate conditions of learning (Elmore, 1991; Evertson & Murphy, in press; Lieberman, 1988; Rowan, 1990). Our purpose in this article, therefore, is to shed some light on issues of how school restructuring might affect curriculum and instruction and, more specifically, to draw connections between teaching and learning and emerging governance structures and processes.

A second conclusion that we have reached in our study of restructuring is that, in the dialogue about transforming schools, the voices of teachers and administrators are either conspicuous by their absence or drowned out by the din created by academicians, policymakers, and business persons (Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, in press). Therefore, in this article, we build on the beliefs and speculations of teachers and administrators to paint our portrait of the direction that school restructuring may take. We note both areas of agreement and disagreement in their perceptions. We discuss the implications these differences hold for efforts to redesign education.

Research Design

Because limited information is known about teachers' and principals' views on restructuring, we undertook an exploratory study using qualitative methodology. Since our aim was to discover their beliefs and perceptions, we used in-depth interviewing. Finally, because our objective was to probe deeply into teachers' and principals' perspectives and to develop rich descriptions of their views on restructuring, we selected a small sample with whom we could work more intensively. We acknowledge the limitations that accompany the choices made in the procedures employed in conducting our research--specifically those that accompany the small sample size. We present our results within the context of these limitations.

Sample

Fourteen teachers (13 women and one man) from the state of Tennessee participated in the study. Six were elementary school teachers, two taught at the middle school level, and six taught at high schools. Participants' ages ranged from 26 to 50, with teaching experience spanning from three to 20 years. Twelve of the teachers had earned Masters degrees. Since our goal was to paint a picture of how the "average" teacher conceives of restructuring, we selected participants who were neither "super" teachers nor experiencing serious difficulties.

Fifteen principals (two women and thirteen men) from public schools in New York, Illinois, and Tennessee also participated in the study. Six were elementary school principals, four were administrators at the junior high or middle school level, and five others were high school principals. Participants ranged in age from 34 to 58 and in experience as principals from 3 to 23 years. Since our intent was to elicit divergent perspectives on restructuring, we conducted interviews with principals from northern and mid-western industrialized states as well as from a rural southern state. We also selected principals who were beginning restructuring efforts in their districts as well as principals who were still grappling with initiatives from the earlier wave of educational reform.

Instrument

A scheduled interview protocol was developed to assess teachers' and principals' perceptions of restructuring (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). The instrument consisted of 22 open-ended questions drawn from our review of the restructuring literature (Murphy, 1991).

Staff members were initially asked to respond to a series of open-ended, non-cued questions regarding their general feelings about restructuring, their beliefs about whom

they thought might be affected, and their thoughts about the changes that would have to take place in their specific schools in order for restructuring to occur. We then moved to more focused questions about teaching and learning and sought their views about areas of potential change at both the classroom and the school levels. These included: the teaching-learning process in general, teachers' relationships with students, school learning climate, budget development and allocations, curriculum, professional development, student schedules, expenditures of time by teachers and other school professionals, specific teaching practices, organization of students for learning, management of student behavior, outcomes for students, students' interactions with other students, and students' interactions with teachers. Finally, we provided two role-playing scenarios in which each respondent, as a member of the school-based decision-making group, was charged with developing strategies: to establish a learning orientation in the school, to encourage student responsibility for learning, and to improve student learning outcomes.

The framework of the protocol was designed to guide participants to analyze restructuring first in the most general terms--to collect their thoughts on who would be affected, what broad changes would occur, what general alterations at the school and classroom levels they would expect--and then to focus on specific changes at the school and classroom levels. Redundancy was a deliberate feature of the interview protocol. We asked questions that involved the same persons in different contexts. We also addressed similar issues at multiple levels (school, classroom, small group) to learn how principals and teachers view restructuring at varying organizational strata.

Data Collection and Analysis

Each of the 29 interviews lasted between one and two hours. Audio recordings were made of all interviews. These were transcribed and then checked against the taped

discussions. Transcriptions were analyzed qualitatively following procedures outlined by Miles and Huberman (1984). A descriptive matrix comparing and contrasting perceptions on restructuring issues was developed. Coding and analytic induction were employed to develop the themes presented in the remainder of this report.

Results

Elsewhere, we have reported separately on teachers' (Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, in press) and principals' (Hallinger,Murphy, & Hausman, in press) perceptions of restructuring. Here, our goal is to build on these findings with the intent of revealing where the views of these two groups of educators are consistent and where differences of opinion exist. The findings are organized under the following headings: general conceptions of restructuring, potential impact of restructuring, prerequisites for successful implementation, and changes at the classroom and school levels. In general, observed differences in the participants' responses did not conform to patterns related to the level of the school in which they worked, geographic location, district context, or years of experience in education. A small sample size may account for the limited variance in perceptions.

General Conceptions of Restructuring

In this portion of the interview, the questions were structured with as few cues as possible. Our intent was to elicit respondents' perceptions of restructuring unbiased by our beliefs. An overwhelming majority of participants from both groups expressed the belief that restructuring schools was an outstanding idea. They envisioned significant inclusion of teachers in the decision-making process leading to teacher ownership and school improvement through more effective problem solving. The principals mentioned that teachers' ownership of proposed changes could potentially increase their motivation, initiative, and commitment. This suggests their belief that school improvement requires

greater effort on the part of teachers.

While the teachers were unanimous in their support for restructuring, two principals viewed the idea as a good one but with caveats, and two others clearly opposed the concept. The two principals with reservations saw no need to implement an all-purpose solution where there was no perceived problem. One of these individuals, who claimed to be working in a school that had already begun efforts to restructure, viewed the fact that decision-making is slowed down as more people become involved as problematic. Advocates of restructuring argue that the extra time devoted to decision-making should result in better decisions that are also more likely to be successfully implemented.

The two principals who clearly opposed the concept of restructuring cited different reasons. The first saw the necessity of having an individual who had the final authority to make decisions and was, therefore, ultimately accountable to the superintendent and board of education. Although this point was of greater significance to this principal, a majority of the administrators agreed that if parents and teachers are given the authority to make decisions, they must be held accountable for the results. One respondent expressed this general sentiment by stating, "The old theory of if something goes wrong, hang the coach, should not apply." The second principal opposed to restructuring believed it would lead to increased stress on administrators, erode administrative power, and put the building administration at "odds somewhat with the central office which pays lip service to restructuring but doesn't really let go of some of that central authority."

Although the teachers viewed restructuring as a good idea, they expressed considerable skepticism about the system's ability to change. They noted the serious shortcomings of the present educational system and claimed that it functioned only because of "a few good teachers," most of whom were not visible to the community or even to their

colleagues. They blamed the bureaucratic infrastructure for the current crisis in education. Their comments in this regard were consistent with the argument that bureaucratic regulation of schooling clashes with teachers' views of themselves as autonomous professionals (Carnoy & MacDonell, 1989; Lieberman, 1988).

Despite their generally positive responses, the principals cited reservations regarding the practical implications of the restructuring concept. All of the principals noted that some portion of the faculty would have to allocate time for decision-making committees. Several were concerned that this would reduce the teaching effectiveness of those teachers. Furthermore, four of the eleven principals who believed in the merits of restructuring and two administrators who were less supportive argued that many teachers do not want the responsibility of decision-making. In their view, a relatively small percentage wanted the type of extensive involvement in decision-making envisioned by reformers. They contended that even fewer teachers would be interested once the time commitment necessary for true involvement in decision-making became clear.

Potential Impact of Restructuring

Most of the comments of teachers and principals concerning the general nature of restructuring focused on governance issues, decision-making, and professional roles. The primary impetus behind school restructuring, however, has been the need to improve teaching and learning in schools. We were, therefore, interested in discovering the potential impact of school restructuring as viewed by school professionals. Would restructuring, as they conceived of it, affect parents, teachers, or students? Would its impact be felt most strongly in school governance, teaching and learning, teacher morale, parent satisfaction, or some other area of school functioning?

Impact on teachers. The consensus among both groups was that school restructuring

would have its greatest impact on the role of teachers, who would assume more responsibility in a restructured decision-making process. Despite their uncertainty over the extent to which teachers really desire this increased involvement, the principals, like the teachers, envisioned this greater sense of responsibility and ownership leading to more teacher collaboration and participation. Several principals also projected that these new roles would lead to higher teacher self-esteem which would carry over and positively influence students.

Although the majority of both groups predicted positive changes for teachers, they expressed serious concerns about possible increases in pressure. The administrators anticipated pressure on teachers "to perform or get out" of restructured schools. One individual went as far as to cite the necessity of eliminating tenure. Several school leaders also commented on the unanticipated impact of the tensions that accompany participation in decision-making. One principal summarized this perspective remarking, "The people who now feel that that's what they want [shared decision-making] don't have to deal with the political pressures, the board pressures, the central office pressures, etc...." They also anticipated that as teachers played a larger role in the decision-making process, they would become more independent thinkers and struggle to break away from union control. These potential sources of tension exemplify the administrators' tendency to view the educational enterprise through a more political framework than teachers.

A potential contradiction was apparent in the conceptions of time allocation voiced by both groups. While the teachers desired increased involvement in school decision-making, they also called for more uninterrupted instructional and planning time. Several principals expressed the reservation that increased allocation of time for decision-making committees by teachers would reduce classroom effectiveness. One principal stated, "The

more you pull a teacher out of the classroom, the less the students get." This is a dilemma that awaits creative resolution.

Two additional potential problems were noted by the teachers. First, they alluded to the additional paperwork that could accompany restructuring efforts. This is congruent with their inclination to attribute the shortcomings of the educational system to its bureaucratic infrastructure. Ironically, the principals saw restructuring as a tool to reduce the teacher paperwork load through greater school level autonomy, fewer mandates from the state, federal, and central office levels, and additional clerical support. Does increased paperwork stem from centralization or decentralization? Tyack (1990) comments:

> To the degree that school governance is now characterized by fragmented centralization, we may have the worst of both worlds: many accountants to higher state and federal authorities but few people really accountable to students or parents. Eliminating overlapping jurisdictions and unnecessary paperwork may require both more centralization and more decentralization, depending on the particular function. (p. 187)

Impact on administrators. Principals and teachers viewed the effects of restructuring on administrators almost exclusively in terms of power. The principals forecast fewer decisions made alone and a loss of control and power. One principal stated bluntly, "I think the administrator, if he has any insight into anything, could see the handwriting on the wall. He has two choices, change or get out." This is congruent with one group of teachers who wanted the role of administrators deemphasized and their influence greatly reduced. Although they predicted a reluctance on the part of principals to change, they believed that the decision-making reins should be handed over to the teaching corps and that principals

should maintain their administrative duties and leave teachers alone.

In contrast, a second group of teachers believed that principals should be entrusted with more power to do their jobs (e.g., discretion to fire teachers who are not performing), and that they should devote considerably more energy to working with teachers on important schooling issues (e.g., the curriculum). Similarly, some principals thought that with the increased delegation of selected responsibilities, they would be able to devote more time to teacher development. They also envisioned benefits in the effectiveness of their decision-making due to the exposure from additional perspectives in the decision-making process.

Impact on parents. Both teachers and principals raised concerns regarding parental involvement in school decision-making. They noted in particular that it would be difficult for parents to be aware of the latest educational trends. This perspective was captured in the folk wisdom of an administrator who remarked that "people are not experts on schools simply because they attended one." The principals also noted that the parents involved on a school's leadership council would not represent the entire community. They feared that parental input on decisions would be based on self-interest as opposed to needs perceived by significant portions of the community. During a period in which reformers are calling for greater equity in educational financing, distribution of resources, and quality of instruction, this poses a potentially serious problem. Carnoy and MacDonell have written:

> Another downside [of shared decision-making] is that the low-income pupils who could profit most from innovative, at-risk focussed programs are the ones with the least vocal, least politically powerful parents. This makes things more difficult for those teachers and principals... who want to see more resources going to those pupils. (1989, p. 20)

Impact on students. In their initial responses, only six teachers and seven principals mentioned the likelihood students would be touched by restructuring efforts. When pressed on this point, teachers noted the potential of both affective and academic benefits accruing to pupils. In contrast, the responses of the majority of principals tended to focus exclusively on affective gains.

In terms of academic outcomes, teachers described improvements in basic literacy, critical thinking, creativity, inquisitiveness, and independence of thought. Similarly, those principals who did foresee cognitive gains hoped that students would become "better problem solvers and less regurgitators." They also spoke of restructured schools helping students to take greater responsibility for their own learning and to become lifelong learners. Although almost all of our respondents attributed these potential gains to the restructuring process, one individual poignantly stated, "I'm not sure restructuring guarantees any outcomes. I think that it is a result of your commitment to whatever it is you are doing."

Somewhat surprisingly, even when the focus was on student outcomes, there was hardly any mention of testing. There seemed to be an implicit belief among both groups that the assessment system would adapt to measure both cognitive and affective outcomes. In providing a suggestion on how to use this assessment data, one principal concluded, "We have to start dealing with that [assessment results] in an atmosphere where we're not looking to blame anyone for failure, but we are looking to identify what's going on so that we can make it better."

Prerequisites for Successful Implementation

There was surprising agreement between the teachers and administrators on the nature of the changes needed to make restructuring work. Both deemed a clear definition of

restructuring and collaboration between all groups involved as fundamental to success. These beliefs were reflected in phrases such as, "commitment to these new partnerships," "having trust in the system... a belief that it can be done," and "clear role definitions."

Teachers and principals also reported that extensive training in shared decision-making and effective schools research and practice was essential to prepare parents, teachers, principals, central office administrators, and school board members for restructuring. The teachers identified their own need for training in administrative skills and learning how to lead. For their principals, they saw the need to learn how to lead through collaboration and consensus, or as one teacher poignantly remarked, to learn to be "not as domineering." Although the principals stated similar needs, they added the need to train teachers to be better teachers. The two groups seemed to perceive each other's weaknesses more clearly than their own and to scrutinize the other to identify potential obstacles to restructuring.

As might be anticipated due to the historical lack of teacher input into fiscal matters, only the administrators identified the budget as a possible constraint to restructuring. They listed broad-based financial support as necessary, as well as the need for a contingency budget to be prepared for unanticipated problems. They also identified the development of an accountability policy given shared decision-making and an ongoing means of assessment as fundamental.

Changes in Classrooms and Schools

After hearing the teachers' and principals' general conceptions of restructuring, we encouraged them to project themselves into a restructured school where shared decision-making had been implemented--where the staff at the school had been given considerable autonomy over such areas as budget, curriculum, scheduling, and professional development. We asked them how conditions, processes, and activities might change at

both the school and classroom levels given this type of restructured environment. At this point, the probes were still very general, e.g., "Given SBM and shared decision-making, what changes would you envision in the area of curriculum?" We group the themes culled from the responses into the following sections: curriculum, teacher roles and workplace, organizing for learning and managing classroom behavior, and professional development.

Curriculum. The most consistent theme reported by both groups was their desire for a more integrated curriculum delivered more cooperatively by the teachers. With an increasing amount of information in the curriculum, they affirmed the importance of teaching the whole child and ridding education of "curricular debris" by implementing a coherent curriculum. At the same time, many of the teachers reported that they would make available a specific course to meet the needs of their particular students, e.g. a home economics course at the elementary level, or an AIDS curriculum. While this is consistent with the concept of local responsiveness, it appears inconsistent with expressed interests in developing an integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum.

While the teachers unanimously envisioned a greater role for themselves in developing this curriculum, only three principals believed that teachers should be given this responsibility, and all three warned that extensive training and a great deal of time would be required in order for teachers to be successful in this endeavor. One principal, who opposed a teacher developed curriculum, added, "I do not find my staff to be knowledgeable at all about curriculum innovation or current research."

Despite being asked to project themselves into a restructured school with the ability to initiate a wide range of changes, the principals were clearly skeptical about the system's ability to move away from a deeply entrenched state-mandated curriculum. One remarked,

"The method of instruction may change, but the curriculum will not. The curriculum has been clearly defined by the state and we have to live within those boundaries." The teachers in general desired greater control over the curriculum with fewer mandates from the state and local authorities. Consistent with our earlier discussion, only one respondent from each group foresaw a role for parents in revamping the school's curriculum.

Teacher roles and workplace. There was surprising congruence in the views of the teachers and principals on how restructuring might affect the teaching-learning process. They envisioned an interdisciplinary curriculum that fosters more collaborative activity among teachers. This collaboration was expected to result in instruction that was more considerate of different learning styles. Furthermore, there would be less reliance on lectures and worksheets, and more hands-on lessons which would enable students to become more actively involved. Finally, they hoped for a greater diversity of student-centered instructional strategies, such as cooperative learning, which require the teacher to be "more of a facilitator... less a feeder of information." The teachers clearly stated that greater teacher choice would serve as the vehicle to achieve this type of learning environment.

Both groups of participants predicted that restructuring would significantly influence teachers' allocation of time. As they projected themselves into the future, they foresaw a greater proportion of teachers' available time being devoted to instructional activities. The teachers also expressed a desire for more time available for personal and developmental needs. Both groups believed that this additional time would be gained through: the employment of paraprofessionals to handle a variety of nonteaching duties (e.g., monitoring the cafeteria and parking lot, providing clerical assistance to teachers); more efficient and flexible scheduling; employment of parents and other community members as

instructional aides; more collaborative student work; and closer coordination of work among teachers. They envisioned devoting this additional time to collaborative student-centered planning and instructional activities. As one teacher succinctly stated, "Give me more teaching duties; I'd love it!" The principals also saw a direct connection between this additional time for professional activities and teachers' attitudes towards their work. They predicted better teacher attendance, more willingness to help students before and after normal school hours, and "less time spent complaining."

In terms of scheduling, there was a consensus among both groups that the traditional school year needs to be reconfigured by implementing shorter, staggered breaks in place of one extended summer vacation. However, there were two distinct opinions regarding the length of the school day. While the teachers neglected to address whether or not the school day should be altered, seven principals recommended that it be extended, but three others argued that this would be unrealistic because of its impact on families, school budgets, and the transportation system. When asked about schedule changes, another principal reaffirmed the intensity of state influence by responding, "In my own mind, I can't go so far as to say well we're not going to worry about state mandates."

At the classroom level, both sets of educators would restructure schedules so that their lessons would be controlled less by the clock and organizational routines and more by the dictates of the learning activities themselves. Secondly, they would greatly reduce external interruptions that encroached on academic learning time (e.g., public address announcements, pullouts from regular classrooms). Finally, the teachers wanted to reform school schedules so that they could spend more quality time with fewer students. Likewise, the principals supported reduced class sizes and scheduling an advisory period to enable students and teachers to develop more positive relationships.

After overcoming an initial hesitance to describe new personal relationships with students, likely due to a belief that this might reduce their authority and control, the teachers' descriptions were very similar to those of the administrators. Both groups maintained that there would be more of a partnership between teachers and students in their restructured schools. They spoke of cooperation and mutual responsibility for learning. They hypothesized that smaller class sizes and more student-centered lessons would result in more genuinely personal student-teacher relationships. The principals claimed that the teachers would serve as advisors and as role models for the students, and there would be a mutual respect for each others' feelings. This is congruent with the teachers' description of an environment characterized by trust, openness, and other family-like qualities, in which the students would know that the teachers truly cared about them as individuals.

Organizing for learning and managing classroom behavior. There was very little agreement between and within these groups of educators on how to best group students for maximum learning. All but one of the teachers reported that there would be both heterogenous and homogeneous grouping arrangements in their restructured schools. Furthermore, for every principal who provided a suggestion on grouping, a colleague expressed an opposing viewpoint. Recommendations included grouping by interests, age, ability, learning styles, interdisciplinary teams, and mainstreaming all students. The only common theme echoed by the principals and teachers was that grouping practices must be tailored to meet students' needs, and students must be organized in a manner that enables them to learn from one another. Despite fundamental disagreements over the nature of grouping strategies, a strong belief was expressed that cooperative learning and peer tutoring would be defining characteristics of restructuring schools.

As a group, the principals supported student management approaches that "focused on the positive rather than the negative" and were "preventative as opposed to corrective or punitive." Suggested steps to achieve this goal included hiring additional counselors, earlier intervention by a larger number of social workers, and doing away with the disciplinarian position. As the latter suggests, they predicted teachers would assume greater responsibility for managing student behavior. Their focus was on support structures which would enable teachers to be successful at this endeavor (e.g., more counselors, decreased class sizes, increased parental support, and a school-wide discipline policy). They did not, however, mention training teachers to enhance classroom management skills. On the contrary, the teachers focused on techniques that they could rely on to improve discipline (e.g., increased positive reinforcement, more positive attitudes toward teaching, sharing trade secrets with one another, and training on a discipline management plan). Not surprisingly, given their emphasis on strategies such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring, both groups foresaw greater student involvement in managing their own behavior.

Professional development. The principals interviewed had far more highly developed visions regarding the role of professional development in their restructured schools than the participating teachers. Excluding their expressed need for training in administrative skills and human relations processes, which we discussed earlier, no major themes emerged from the teachers' responses.

The principals also noted that training would be essential to help staff, parents, students, and administrators understand what restructuring involves and to learn how to participate effectively in an environment characterized by shared decision-making and collaborative work relationships. Furthermore, they supported training those involved in restructuring

to provide them with the tools necessary to assume new roles and responsibilities (e.g., assisting teachers to develop decision-making, communication, and group process skills).

However, the administrators identified a second role for staff development in a restructured school. They were adamant about the need for restructured schools to develop ongoing professional development plans tailored to the school's vision and supported by the budget. As stated previously, they emphasized the value and need for staff development to enhance teacher performance. Staff would be more involved in the selection and delivery of professional development activities. Finally, after noting a reluctance on the part of many teachers to take time off to participate in professional growth activities, they foresaw increased collegial pressure to attend workshops with an obligation to share information upon returning.

Discussion

In this article, we have reported the perceptions held by selected American teachers and principals regarding reforms that fall under the rubric of school restructuring. A premise of this study was that the success or failure of the movement to restructure schools would be based to a great extent on the ability of educators to conceptualize new solutions to both persisting and new problems. The findings of this study were limited to a description of the current thinking of selected teachers and administrators in the United States. While we do not assume that the data are the equivalent of information generated by a staff engaged in ongoing, creative problem-solving, the results suggest directions in which the restructuring movement may move as well as some of the obstacles that may be encountered.

In this final section, we discuss three particularly salient issues that emerged from the results. These issues are: 1) the connection between changes in school governance structures and changes in teaching and learning, 2) the nature of teachers' participation in

school decision-making, and 3) decision-making and accountability.

School Governance and the Teaching-Learning Process

A finding that was predictable, yet surprising, concerned the lack of connections made by teachers and principals between new governance structures and the teaching-learning process. This finding was predictable in the sense that there is a long history of education reforms in which curriculum innovations have been displaced in practice by governance procedures (Cuban, 1984; Sarason, 1990). At the same time, this finding was surprising in that few, if any, of these educators voiced a perspective on school restructuring that was driven first and foremost by a vision of teaching and learning -- good, bad or indifferent. This was reflected in the relatively few references made to the potential impact of restructuring on students' cognitive development. It was also apparent in the paucity of concrete examples of how restructured schools might reorganize curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of students. In sum, neither the teachers nor the principals seemed to view restructuring as a reform designed to assist students.

Given these observations, we wonder how restructuring, in practice, will serve the needs of students. Smith and O'Day (1990) note:

> Although restructuring literature stresses the critical importance of developing complex problem-solving and higher order thinking skills in our youth, achieving this goal requires a major reorientation in content and pedagogy as well as in the structure of the educational enterprise. . . . Site-based management, professional collaboration, incentives and choice may be important elements of the change process, but they alone will not produce the kinds of changes in content and pedagogy that appear critical to our

national well being. (p. 2-3)

Neither the principals nor the teachers in this study appeared to have a vision of how schooling might change to accommodate the changing needs of students and society. This is significant given the relatively high levels of education and sophistication of these educators and their general support for restructuring. It highlights the need for more intensified discussion on the educational components of restructuring among teachers and administrators. It also reinforces the importance of connecting practitioners to channels through which they can develop the skills needed to implement new governance mechanisms and new pedagogical methods.

Teachers' Participation in School Decision-making

A second issue highlighted in the study concerned the perspectives of principals and teachers towards teachers' involvement in decision-making. Teachers and administrators took quite different positions on this issue. The teachers explicitly favored a more active role in technical decision-making, though they were not convinced that such participation would be authentic. At the same time, administrators tended to question the number of teachers who wanted to participate in school decision-making. Furthermore, they wondered how long that interest would last once the reality of increased meeting time, commitments, and conflict set in.

This contrast in views is consistent with prior research on this issue. For example in one study, Duke and his colleagues found that teachers viewed shared decision-making as a, "formality or an attempt to create the illusion of teacher influence" (Duke, Showers & Imber, 1980). They noted:

> This frequently heard complaint of teachers, that their involvement made little or no difference, provides a key to understanding the findings of this study. Since the

> teachers were less than enthusiastic about participating in shared decision-making even though they viewed the potential benefits as high and the potential costs as low, it is reasonable to conclude that they believed that the probability of actually realizing the potential benefits of participation was low. (1980, p.104)

Thus, it may be true that teachers are both reluctant to participate in school decision-making, and also desirous of exercising more influence in the school (Duke & Gansneder, 1990).

This highlights the importance of treating influence as a dimension separate from participation in decision-making. Teachers do not want to be involved in decision-making without clear designation of their role and authority in the process. The teachers in this study were skeptical that administrators would willingly share their authority in the decision-making process. They seemed to believe that school administrators would find excuses to hold onto their authority or would devise ways to mitigate the effects of new governance structures. This skepticism is consistent with the rhetoric of reform advocates who question the extent to which school administrators can be the leaders of truly radical reform. These critics have suggested that inevitably, school administrators will be reluctant to relinquish the reins of control and, if unchecked, will prevent fundamental change from occurring (Chubb, 1988; Lieberman, 1988).

While such skepticism does not seem unreasonable given the failure of past efforts to systematically involve teachers in decision-making, the data available to assess the issue of influence are preliminary and conflicting. Substantial restructuring efforts in a number of American school districts (Dade County, FL; Sarasota, FL; White Plains, NY; Santa Fe, NM) have been initiated by school superintendents (Carnoy & MacDonell, 1989; David, 1990; Hallinger & Edwards, in press; Hallinger & Yanofsky, 1990; Tyack, 1990). Furthermore, in

several of these cases, the decision to adopt radical reform measures was made in anticipation of, rather than in response to significant educational problems (Carnoy & MacDonell, 1989; Hallinger & Edwards, in press; Hallinger & Yanofsky, 1990).

While some superintendents have assumed leadership roles in restructuring schools and school systems, principals have not been key players in the conceptualization of restructuring. Although principals remain the gatekeepers of change at the school site, they have been relatively passive recipients of this latest round of educational reform. Only after restructuring efforts have gotten underway are principals becoming involved. The reactive quality of this response was recently illustrated in the decision of principals in Los Angeles to form a union as a means of exercising voice in the district's plan for restructuring (Bradley, 1990). For the first time, the principals in this large district will not be a part of the district's official management team.

Decision-making and Accountability

While accountability has long been a popular target of critics of shared decision-making (Geisert, 1988), it is only recently that this issue has begun to receive close attention (Cohen, 1990; David, 1990; Smith & O'Day, 1990; Sykes, 1990; Tyack, 1990). Our findings reaffirm the intensity of accountability concerns in a shared decision-making environment. Furthermore, the data suggest that considerable energies will need to be focused on the resolution of these concerns before restructuring efforts will effect positive change.

Although the teachers in this study overwhelmingly favored a greater voice in the decision-making process, they neglected to address how they might share accountability for decisions. Furthermore, they did not appear to view accountability as a problem that they needed to address. It may be that since teachers have been largely buffered from institutional or professional accountability in the past, the connection between increased

involvement in decision-making and accountability remains an abstract issue for them.

On the other hand, the principals expressed serious concerns over the prospect of mandated teacher participation in school governance in the absence of clearly defined means of assessing accountability. They resented the prospect of being on the "hot seat" for school decisions reached jointly by a school-based council, particularly if they held but a single vote on the council. The vividness of the principals' concern for accountability stands in stark contrast to the absence of teacher engagement on this issue.

An interesting contrast also emerged in discussions of empowerment. As noted earlier, teachers doubt that principals will share authority over school decisions, even if compelled through district policy. Although the teachers attributed considerable power to their principals, it is ironic that the principals in this study did not view themselves as owning a significant piece of the decision-making pie. In fact, they questioned the willingness of their own superordinates to change either their own leadership practices or the sphere of decisions over which the school is responsible. One principal suggested that the central office "pays lip service to restructuring but doesn't really let go of some of that central authority." Initial evidence suggests that this skepticism is not without justification (Chapman & Boyd, 1986; Hallinger & Yanofsky, 1990; Seeley et al., 1990), although, there are also favorable reports from districts that are experimenting with original accountability policies (David, 1990).

Perhaps the most interesting data related to the issues of participation and accountability in this study concerned the attitudes of teachers and principals towards parental involvement. Both the principals and teachers raised serious questions regarding the appropriateness and potential effectiveness of parental involvement in curricular and instructional decision-making. Neither group of educators was convinced that parental

involvement would solve more problems than it would cause. This perspective runs counter to the strong trend in the restructuring literature advocating a more significant role for parents in public schooling.

It remains to be seen which levels of the hierarchy, if any, will relinquish power. The route taken by most restructuring efforts has begun by changing governance procedures at the school site. We are pessimistic, however, about the likelihood that formalized procedures for sharing authority will achieve the desired ends in the absence of trust, a commodity that seems to be in short supply.

This article has highlighted differences in the perspectives of teachers and principals towards school restructuring. While the differences in their points of view are not insignificant, we would note, in conclusion, that a more fundamental discrepancy is apparent when the views of these practitioners are compared with those of the policy community that is driving education reform. This is particularly salient with respect to the issue of connecting reforms in education governance with changes in classroom practice. If school restructuring is to succeed, better connections will need to be forged between these communities. In particular, schools will need to find the resources that can assist practitioners in developing knowledge about curriculum and instruction that will meet the demands of our future society. The alternative is that schools will reduce restructuring to a new governance process that fails to influence what goes on beyond the classroom door.

References

Bradley, A. (1991, March 20). Administrators in Los Angeles form a bargaining unit. Education Week, 10 (26), pp. 1, 14.

Carnoy, M. & MacDonell, J. (1989, December). School district restructuring in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Center for Policy Research in Education Research Report Series RR-017.

Chapman, J., & Boyd, W. (1986). Decentralization, devolution, and the school principal: Australian lessons on statewide educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22 (4), 25-28.

Chubb, J. (1988). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. Public Interest, 90, 28-49.

Cohen, D. (1990). Key issues facing state policymakers. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 251-288). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

David, J. (1990). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 209-250), San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Duke, D. & Gansneder, B. (1990). Teacher empowerment: The view from the classroom. Educational Policy, 4(2), pp. 145-160.

Duke, D., Showers, B., K., & Imber, M. (1980, Winter). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (1), 93-106.

Elmore, R. (1990a). Introduction: On changing the structure of public schools. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 128) San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Elmore, R. (1990b). Conclusion: Towards a transformation of public schooling. In R.

Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 289-298). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Elmore, R. (1991, April). Teaching, learning, and school organization: School restructuring and the recurring dilemmas of policy and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Evertson, C., & Murphy, J. (in press). Implications for restructuring schools. In H.H. Marshall (Ed.), Redefining student learning: Routes of educational change. Norwood,N.J.: Ablex.

Geisert, G. (1988). Participatory management: Panacea or hoax? Educational Leadership, 46(3), 56-59.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Hallinger, P. & Edwards, M. (in press). The paradox of superintendent leadership in school restructuring. School Effectiveness and School Improvement.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (in press). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly.

Hallinger, P. & Yanofsky, S. (1990). Gearing up to change slowly: Restructuring roles and relationships and the district level. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 648-653.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomenon.

New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980's: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases (pp. 3-56). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Murphy, J., Evertson, C., & Radnofsky, M. (in press). Restructuring schools: Fourteen elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on reform. Elementary School Journal.

Rowan, B. (1990). Applying conceptions of teaching to organizational reform. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 31-58). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sarason, S. (1990). What are schools of education for? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Seeley, D., Niemeyer, J., & Greenspan, R. (1990, May). Principals speak on restructuring and school leadership. Report #1. New York.

Smith, M., & O'Day, J. (1990). Systemic school reform. Paper prepared for inclusion in S. Fuhrman and B. Malen (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Sykes, G. (1990). Rethinking teacher professionalism in schools. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 59-96). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Tyack, D. (1990). Restructuring in historical perspective: Tinkering towards utopia. Teachers College Record, 92 2), 170-191.

1. Philip Hallinger is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership in Peabody College of Vanderbilt University and Director of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Leadership. Joseph Murphy is Professor and Chair in the Department of Educational Leadership in Peabody College. Charles Hausman is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership.

2. Support for this research was provided by the National Center for Educational Leadership (NCEL) under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. R117C8005. The views in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the sponsoring agency nor the Universities in the NCEL Consortium--The University of Chicago, Harvard University, and Vanderbilt University.

The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of Barbara Habschmidt in collecting the data for this study and to thank the teachers and principals who offered their time and support for the project.